

**REMARKS**

This Response is submitted in answer to the Examiner's Action mailed February 25, 2004, with a shortened statutory period of three months set to expire May 25, 2004. Claims 1-10 are currently pending. None of the claims has been amended.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 8, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Microsoft Word: User's Guide", 1993-1994, version 6.0, pages 48-50 [hereinafter *Microsoft*]. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' claim 1 describes comparing character information for each character in a document to character information in a target replacement font set to generate a comparison table. The comparison table is presented to a user. The user amends errors in the table. The character information is replaced in the document based on the comparison table as amended.

*Microsoft* does not describe, teach, or suggest (1) the step of comparing; (2) comparing character information including character code and font information; (3) comparing character information including character code and font information for each character in a document; (4) generating a comparison table; (5) amending the comparison table; (6) amending errors in the comparison table; (7) replacing character information; or (8) replacing character information based on the comparison table as amended.

*Microsoft* describes a Symbol font from which a symbol may be selected. The Symbol font set is provided with Microsoft Word. The symbols in the Symbol font set are provided as part of the Symbol font set. These symbols in the font cannot be altered, added, or deleted from the font set.

When a user wishes to insert a symbol into a document using *Microsoft*, the user places the cursor in the document where the user wishes the symbol to appear. The user then selects a font set, such as the Symbol font set, from which to select a symbol or other character. The table depicted on page 49 is displayed. The user then selects the symbol from the table, such as by double-clicking on the desired symbol. This selection then causes the symbol to appear in the document at the cursor's location.

*Microsoft* does not describe, teach, or suggest the step of comparing. Nothing in the reference describes comparing a character in the document to anything else. Nothing

in the reference describes comparing character information including both character code and font information. And, nothing in the reference describes comparing character information for each character in a document.

*Microsoft* does not describe, teach, or suggest the step of comparing character information. A position in a document, according to *Microsoft*, may be selected by a user into which a symbol can be inserted. This position is a physical location in the document. This position is not related to any character in the document. When the symbol is inserted, the symbol does not replace an existing character. The selected symbol is not a replacement for a character in the document. The selected symbol is inserted into the document as an additional symbol in the document.

Applicants describe comparing character information including character code and font information to character information in a target replacement font set. *Microsoft* does not describe, teach, or suggest the step of comparing. *Microsoft* also does not describe, teach, or suggest the step of comparing character information including character code and font information. *Microsoft* merely teaches that a symbol, or other character, can be selected from a preset table of characters and then inserted into a document.

*Microsoft* does not describe, teach, or suggest comparing character information for each character in a document to character information in a target replacement font set to generate a comparison table. *Microsoft* does not describe, teach, or suggest generating a comparison table. The Symbol font table depicted on page 49 is provided by Microsoft Word as part of the software. This table is not generated. It is retrieved when a user selects a particular font set, such as the Symbol font set, to use.

*Microsoft* does not describe, teach, or suggest comparing character information for each character in a document to character information in a target replacement font set. When a user wishes to insert a symbol, the user may use the symbol table of *Microsoft* to select a symbol. The user selects a position in the document where the selected symbol is to be inserted. According to *Microsoft*, the user selects a symbol. The character information including character code and font information of a selected symbol are not compared to anything else. The symbol is merely selected. No comparison is made. No comparison of including character code and font information is made.

Applicants describe amending errors in the comparison table. *Microsoft* does not describe, teach, or suggest the possibility that errors might exist in the table depicted on page 49. *Microsoft* does not describe, teach, or suggest amending the table in any way. This table is presented to the user. The user can select a symbol from the table. The user cannot amend the table.

Applicants describe replacing character information in the document based on the amended comparison table. As described above, *Microsoft* does not describe, teach, or suggest replacing character information or amending the comparison table.

*Microsoft* does not describe, teach, or suggest (1) the step of comparing; (2) comparing character information including character code and font information; (3) comparing character information including character code and font information for each character in a document; (4) generating a comparison table; (5) amending the comparison table; (6) amending errors in the comparison table; (7) replacing character information; or (8) replacing character information based on the comparison table as amended.

The Examiner rejects these claims as being unpatentable over *Microsoft* without stating what feature claimed by Applicants is not taught by *Microsoft* but rendered unpatentable as being an obvious change to *Microsoft*.

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Microsoft* in view of U.S. Patent 5,167,013 issued to *Hube* and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,426,751 issued to *Patel*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

*Hube* describe a single font that is used for printing an entire document. *Hube* does not describe comparing character information for each character. *Hube* does not describe replacing character information for each character. *Hube* describe merely changing from one font, such as Times New Roman 12 point, to a different font, such as Times New Roman 10 point, when printing an entire document. Because *Hube* does not describe, teach, or suggest (1) comparing character information for each character, or (2) comparing character information that includes both character code and font information, *Hube* does not render Applicants' claims unpatentable.

*Patel* describes font feature file processing. The Examiner states that *Hube* does not describe inputting font object information to describe rule set to limit objects of

character comparison and a rule set related to mapping for each kanji radical. The Examiner further states that *Patel* disclosed the use of glyphName to glyphID mappings.

The combination of *Microsoft*, *Hube*, and *Patel* does not describe, teach, or suggest comparing character information for each character or comparing character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with inputting a font object information to describe a rule set to limit objects of character comparison and a rule set related to mapping for each kanji radical.

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Microsoft* in view of *Hube* and *Patel* and further in view of "Item-Mapping Subsystem", by *IBM TDB*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 describes outputting weighting information regarding mapping between similar character codes in a reference file. The combination of *Microsoft*, *Hube*, *Patel*, and *IBM TDB* does not describe, teach, or suggest comparing character information for each character or comparing character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with outputting weighting information regarding mapping between similar character codes in a reference file.

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Microsoft* in view of *Hube* and *Patel* and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,360,223 issued to *Ng*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 describes comparing character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with a comparison table candidate list that takes as its elements groups comprising one character code within a source font and character codes within a target font compatible with the source font. The combination of *Microsoft*, *Hube*, *Patel*, and *Ng* does not describe, teach, or suggest comparing character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with a comparison table candidate list that takes as its elements groups comprising one character code within a source font and character codes within a target font compatible with the source font.

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Microsoft* in view of *Hube*, *Patel*, and *Ng*, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,257,323 issued to *Melen*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 5 describes character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with a comparison table candidate list that takes as its elements groups comprising one character code within a source font and character codes within a target font compatible with the source font and in combination with adding priority level information for the plurality of character codes within the target font.

The combination of *Microsoft*, *Hube*, *Patel*, *Ng* and *Melen* does not describe, teach, or suggest comparing character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with a comparison table candidate list that takes as its elements groups comprising one character code within a source font and character codes within a target font compatible with the source font and in combination with adding priority level information for the plurality of character codes within the target font.

The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Microsoft* in view of *Hube* and *Ng*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 describes comparing character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with the comparison table being a list taking as elements a corresponding relationship between a group of a source font set and character code within this source font set and a group of a target font set and character code within this target font set. The combination of *Microsoft*, *Hube*, and *Ng* does not describe, teach, or suggest comparing character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with the comparison table being a list taking as elements a corresponding relationship between a group of a source font set and character code within this source font set and a group of a target font set and character code within this target font set.

The Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Microsoft* in view of *Hube* and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,389,178 issued to *Agazzi*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 describes the step of comparing being carried out automatically using Optical Character Recognition (OCR) technology. The combination of *Microsoft*, *Hube*, and *Agazzi* does not describe, teach, or suggest comparing character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with the step of

comparing being carried out automatically using Optical Character Recognition (OCR) technology.

The Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Microsoft* in view of *Hube*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 describes a comparison table and rule set describing a structure of a source document being input and standardization of fonts and character code used in the source document being carried out in the step of replacing the character information. The combination of *Microsoft* and *Hube* does not describe, teach, or suggest comparing character information for each character in a document to character information in a target replacement font set to generate a comparison table where the user amends errors in the table and the character information is replaced in the document based on the comparison table as amended in combination with a comparison table and rule set describing a structure of a source document being input and standardization of fonts and character code used in the source document being carried out in the step of replacing the character information.

The combination of references does not describe teach or suggest (1) the step of comparing; (2) comparing character information including character code and font information; (3) comparing character information including character code and font information for each character in a document; (4) generating a comparison table; (5) amending the comparison table; (6) amending errors in the comparison table; (7) replacing character information; or (8) replacing character information based on the comparison table as amended. Therefore, the references do not render Applicants' claims unpatentable.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: 04.26.04

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Yociss

Lisa L.B. Yociss  
Reg. No. 36,975  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 367-2001  
Attorney for Applicants